



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Uno Lindelöf, *Glossar zur Altnorthumbrischen Evangelien-übersetzung in der Rushworth-Handschrift* (*Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicæ*, Tom. XXII., No. 5). Helsingfors, 1897. Pp. iv, 104.

THIS is a rather inconvenient quarto ( $28\frac{3}{4} \times 16\frac{1}{4}$  in.) of some 104 pages, covering the so-called Rushworth<sup>2</sup>, from Mk. 2. 15 to the end of John. The author, who is Docent of Germanic Philology at the University of Helsingfors, had already written two papers on inflectional and phonological points in the Rushworth and Lindisfarne Glosses (*Memoires de la Société Néo-Philologique à Helsingfors*, I. (1893) 219-302, and Herrig's *Archiv*, LXXXIX. 129 ff.), which were sound contributions to scholarship; and the present publication is deserving of the same praise.

As his general model, the author appears to have taken my *Glossary of the Old Northumbrian Gospels*, to which he several times refers. The following differences, however, may be noted:

(a) He does not mark quantity, nor assign diacritical indications to the derivative *e* and *o* (*ē*, *ō*), in the head-words of his articles.

(b) He is considerably less full in his citation of examples.

(c) The cross-references from simple words to their derivatives are contained in an appendix, instead of being incorporated into the glossary, and there are no cross-references under derivative suffixes.

Under N, Lindelöf's matter is not more than two-fifths as much as in my book. This of course covers both (b) and (c).

(d) There is no Latin-Northumbrian Index.

(e) On the other hand, he has no such formidable list of *errata*, and he does have much fuller explanations of the glossator's blunders and oddities.

I have looked up the words contained on p. 25 of Skeat's *St. Mark*, and in the course of this operation noted the following facts with reference to Lindelöf's work:

(a) When his citations are incomplete, he frequently does not instance the first occurrence of a word in his texts. This seems to me misleading and indefensible. It is certainly as easy to cite the first occurrence as the second or the third.

(b) He sometimes follows the text in writing *v* for *u*, but often does not.

(c) He does not always note the abbreviations of proper names; e.g. Iacobus, Mk. 3. 17.

(*d*) Under *Iohannes*, he has Mk. 3. 17 as *us.*, instead of *as*.

(*e*) Under *Hierusalem* he says: 'oft verkürzt, keine form mit einer Endung.' But he overlooks Mk. 3. 22, where the word is spelled out in full.

(*f*) He notes *eft* only as a prefix, and gives no definition of it as an independent word, nor any instances, referring instead to the words with which it is compounded. But under *sona* there is no reference to the *eftsona* of Mk. 3. 20.

(*g*) The very common word *ilce* he has omitted altogether, without notice or correction.

(*h*) While he has very properly treated *efne* as a prefix in words like *efnegicegde*, though printed separately in the text, he has not been consistent with this in his treatment of *ðona* (*ðona comun* = *descenderant*).

However, after such deductions as these are made, it still remains true that the work is one for which we have every reason to be grateful, and that few persons would have been likely to do it better, if so well.

As Lindelöf speaks of undertaking 'die northumbrische Mundart in einem Zusammenhang,' it may be as well for me to state that my monograph, according to present plans, is to be published as a supplement to the *Journal of Germanic Philology*. For that reason, I trust he will wait yet a little, though of course the publication of any investigation on the *Rushworth* text is perfectly legitimate.

ALBERT S. COOK.

---

*The English Dialect Dictionary*, edited by Joseph Wright, M.A., Ph.D., Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford. Part I., A-Ballot; Part II., Ballow-Blare. London and New York [1896].

THE glorification of democracy brings with it the glorification of dialect. The provincial, feeling himself also to be a man like another—like the denizen of London or Paris, but uneasily conscious that the metropolitan is prodigiously scornful, or at least derisively tolerant, of his claims to equality, can never rest, in a democratic era, until he has vindicated for his rusticity the esteem, if not the applause, of the world. Dante, dreaming of a universal monarchy, could also